



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,541	12/07/2000	Gregory Zoller	CSCO-68341	4178

7590

08/14/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Third Floor

Two North Market Street

San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,541

Applicant(s)

ZOLLER ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the Amendment filed 6/6/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to the Amendment dated June 6, 2003

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said databases" in "b2". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9, 19-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoover et al. (U. S. patent no. 5,560,005).

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Hoover discloses a method of providing access to information comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2171

a) receiving a call from an application program, the call specifying a user identifier and a requested set of information of a plurality of sets of information (see Fig. 3 and col.16, lines 54-58, Hoover). ,

b) in response to the call, determining the location of the requested information corresponding to the user identifier (col. 24, lines 47-49, Hoover);

b1) determining a plurality of fields associated with the requested set of information (see col. 15, lines 5-15 and col. 24, lines 25-33, Hoover); and

b2) accessing a stored mapping of the fields to the databases (see col. 24, lines 9-33, Hoover);

c) using the user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig. 1, Hoover). The information of the "client site 1" corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases;

d) using the user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a second of the plurality of fields from a second of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig.1, Hoover). The information of the "client site 2" corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases; and

e) providing the set of information to the application program, retrieved from the first and second databases without requiring storage on an intermediate database (see col. 11, lines 48-67, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Hoover further discloses determining the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 16, lines 31-35, Hoover).

Regarding claims 3 and 22, Hoover discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Hoover does not explicitly disclose “a pre-determined time has passed since the set of information was accessed, removing the set of information from the cache”. But, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover to remove the information from cache or be kick off from the web when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Regarding claims 4-5 and 21, Hoover further discloses the step of updating a first of the plurality of fields in the set of the information by writing information to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).

Regarding claim 6, Hoover further discloses that the update is based upon monitoring activity of a user of the application program, the activity being related to the information (see col. 53, lines 23-37, Hoover).

Regarding claim 7, Hoover further discloses a first database with entitlement information thereon and a second database with user profile information thereon (see col. 1, lines 4-10 and col. 16, lines 31-35, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 8, Hoover further discloses the steps of providing a parameter to the application program and the application program passing the parameter when requesting user profile data (see col. 29, lines 1-4, Hoover).

Regarding claim 9, Hoover further discloses the step of moving the information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases to a second of the plurality of databases (col. 24, lines 9-33, Hoover).

Regarding claims 23-24, Hoover further discloses that requested set of information comprises information relating to a single user and a group of users (see col. 9, lines 8-47, Hoover).

Regarding claim 28, Hoover further discloses the application programs that are compliant with different program languages for one other (see col. 9, lines 48-65, Hoover).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-18, 25-27 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr (U. S. Patent no. 6,085,976) in view of Hoover et al. (U. S. patent no. 5,560,005).

Regarding claims 10, 16 and 25, Sehr discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon program instructions for providing access to information stored on a plurality of databases:

- the program further operable to process requests from an application program, the requests identifying a first of the plurality of logical collections of the information and a first of a plurality of users (column 6, lines 1-10, Sehr);
- the program further operable to retrieve the information corresponding to the at least the first of the plurality of fields, the information corresponding to the user identified by the request from the application program (column 5, lines 44-49 and column 34, lines 1-8, Sehr).

Sehr, however, does not explicitly disclose the logical mapping and physical mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases. Hoover, on the other hand, discloses the mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases (see Abstract and col. 40, lines 24-56, Hoover). At machine level like the system of Hoover have to have physical address to locate an physical record (see col. 17, lines 4-14, Hoover), and a record have to have the identification (see col. 41, lines 10-19, Hoover) to specify the record that is logical mapping of the records. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sehr to include the logically and physically map of the records as taught by Hoover. The motivation of doing so would have been to manipulate information.

Regarding claim 11, Sehr/Hoover combination further discloses the computer wherein the plurality of databases comprises a first database and a second database (column 5, lines 12-15, Sehr).

Regarding claim 12, Sehr/Hoover combination further discloses the computer wherein the first database comprises entitlement information (see col. 3, lines 59-62, Sehr).

Regarding claim 13, Sehr/Hoover combination further discloses the second database comprises user profile information (see col. 5, lines 64-67, Sehr).

Regarding claims 14 and 26, Sehr/Hoover discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Sehr/Hoover does not explicitly disclose “ a pre-determined time has passed since the set of information was accessed, removing the set of information from the cache”. But, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination system of Sehr/Hoover to remove the information from cache or be kick off from the web when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Regarding claims 15 and 27, Sehr/Hoover combination further discloses operable program to update the information for the first of the logical collections of the information by writing to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).



Regarding claim 17, Sehr/Hoover combination further discloses the information relates to a single user (column 5, lines 64-67, Sehr).

Regarding claim 18, Sehr/Hoover combination further discloses the information pertaining to a group of users (column 5, line 67 to column 6, lines 1, Sehr).

Regarding claims 29-30, Sehr/Hoover combination further discloses the process requests originating from more than one programming language (see col. 9, lines 48-65, Hoover).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2171

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9099 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai *HT*  
Art unit 2171  
August 8, 2003

  
**SAFET METJAHIC**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**